

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner made a provisional restriction requirement, under 35 U.S.C. §121, between 4 species of claims. Applicant provisionally elects Species I (Claims 8, 27 and 28) and Species K (Claims 8, 32 and 33).

The Office Action considers that Claims 32 and 33 belong to different species but Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 33 is merely an aspect of Claim 32 and not a different species. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reclassification of Claims 32 and 33 as the same species.

Moreover, Claim 28 has been amended to depend from Claim 27. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 27 and amended Claim 28 are both a part of provisionally elected Species I.

As the Examiner indicated, independent Claim 8 is generic. Upon the allowance of Claim 8, each of the provisionally withdrawn dependent claims should be rejoined and also allowed.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

March 9, 2009

Date



Attorney for Applicant
Eric D. Babych
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 57,542